



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/924,310	08/06/2001	Charles Han	000004	3087

23696 7590 11/29/2006
QUALCOMM INCORPORATED
5775 MOREHOUSE DR.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121

EXAMINER

ELAHEE, MD S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2614

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/924,310

Applicant(s)

HAN ET AL.

Examiner

Md S. Elahee

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,9,11-15,18-22 and 27-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,9,11-15,18-22 and 27-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2614

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is responsive to an amendment filed on 09/18/2006. Claims 1-5, 9, 11-15, 18-22 and 27-46 are pending. Claims 6-8, 10, 16, 17 and 23-26 have been previously cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 09/18/2006 Remarks regarding claims 29-41 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection which is deemed appropriate to address all of the needs at this time.

3. Applicant's arguments filed on 09/18/2006 Remarks regarding claims 1-5, 9, 11-15, 18-22, 27, 28 and 42-46 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 in view of Hanson:

Regarding claims 42, 45, the Applicant argues on page 10, Hanson does not disclose or teach "checking whether a feature of said wireless communication device has previously been utilized,".

Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant for the argument. Hanson teaches checking whether a voice tag saving or voice dialing feature [i.e., feature] of the wireless

Art Unit: 2614

communication device has previously been utilized (fig.2, item 208). In col.3, lines 26-28, Hanson discloses that a voice-dialing system 107 provides users of telephone [i.e., wireless communication device] with voice dialing capability. Therefore, it is clear that the voice dialing feature is of the wireless communication device. Thus the rejection of the claims 42, 45 in view of Hanson remain.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103 in view of Hanson and Foladare:

Regarding claims 1-5, 9, 11, 13, 14, and 29-32, the Applicant argues on page 11, "First, Hanson and Foladare, alone or in combination, do not teach the methods of Claims 1-5, 9, 11, 13, 14, and 29-32 "performed by a wireless communication device," as stated in independent Claims 1 and 29".

Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant for the argument. The claimed limitation is recited in the preamble of the claim. The body of the claim following the preamble is a self-contained description of the structure and does not depend on the preamble for completeness and therefore, the preamble does not usually limit the claim.

Regarding claims 1, 18, the Applicant argues on page 11 that Foladare does not disclose or teach "checking whether a first voice tag corresponding to any telephone number has already been saved," as recited in Claims 1, 8, and 36". Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant for the argument. In col.7, lines 35-38, Foladare discloses matching [i.e., checking] caller's audible identifiers [i.e., first voice tag corresponding to any telephone number] with

Art Unit: 2614

prerecorded audible identifiers to identify a repeat caller. Thus the rejection of the claims 1, 18 in view of Foladare remain. Further, examiner didn't cite Foladare to reject claim 36.

Regarding claims 29, 42, the Applicant argues on pages 11,12 that Foladare does not disclose or teach "whether a voice tag" is a first voice tag to be saved," as recited in Claim 29; whether a feature "has been previously utilized," as recited in Claim 4. Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant for the argument. Examiner didn't cite Foladare to reject the claims 29 and 42.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103 in view of Foladare and Landell:

Regarding claims 1,18,36 and 42, the Applicant argues on page 12, "Landell does not disclose or teach checks or prompts to determine whether a user has ever used a feature, as recited in Claims 1, 18, 36, and 42".

Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant for the argument. The Applicant didn't claim the limitation. Examiner didn't cite Landell to reject the claims 36 and 42.

Regarding claims 1,18, the Applicant argues on page 12, "Neither Foladare, nor Landell, nor any of the other cited references, disclose checking whether a feature has previously been used by the user of the "wireless communication device," as recited in Claims 1, 18, 29, 36-46".

Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant for the argument. The claimed limitation is recited in the preamble of the claim. The body of the claim following the preamble is a self-contained description of the structure and does not depend on the preamble for

completeness and therefore, the preamble does not usually limit the claim. Thus the rejection of the claims 1, 18 in view of Foladare and Landell remain. Examiner didn't cite Foladare and Landell to reject the claims 29, 36-46.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 42-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hanson (U.S. Patent No. 5,802,149).

Regarding claim 42, Hanson teaches checking whether a voice tag saving or voice dialing feature [i.e., feature] of the wireless communication device has previously been utilized (fig.2, item 208) (Note: In col.3, lines 26-28, Hanson discloses that a voice-dialing system 107 provides users of telephone [i.e., wireless communication device] with voice dialing capability. Therefore, it is clear that the voice dialing feature is of the wireless communication device.);

providing a user with a first prompt for guidance when the feature of the wireless communication device has not previously been utilized (fig.2, item 218) (Note; since the voice tag does not match with stored voice tag, it is clear that the feature for saving/dialing the voice

Art Unit: 2614

tag has not previously been utilized, therefore the system prompts the user for guiding whether the user would like to get directory assistance); and

prompting the user with a second prompt for using the feature when the feature of the wireless communication device has previously been utilized (fig.3, item 248).

Regarding claim 43, Hanson teaches that the first prompt for guidance is for making the user aware of the feature (fig.2, item 208; col.4, lines 5-10).

Regarding claim 44, Hanson teaches that the feature is selected from the group consisting of a number saving feature, a voice tag saving feature, a speed dialing feature, and a voice dialing feature (fig.2, item 206, fig.3, items 242,246,248).

Regarding claim 45, Hanson teaches matching [i.e., checking] whether a first voice tag dialing/saving feature [i.e., first feature] wireless communication device has previously been utilized (fig.2, item 210);

prompting a user [i.e., informing a user of an option] to use a second feature if the first feature of the wireless communication device has previously been utilized (fig.3, item 238; col.4, lines 34-38).

Regarding claim 46, Hanson teaches ending an operation of prompting for the second feature if the first feature of the wireless communication device has previously been utilized (fig.2, item 218).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

Art Unit: 2614

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 1-5, 9, 11, 13, 14, 18-22 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson (U.S. Patent No. 5,802,149) in view of Foladare et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,978,671).

Regarding claims 1, 11, 18, 27, Hanson teaches receiving an incoming call from a first telephone number (col.3, lines 52-55);

checking whether a first voice tag corresponding to any telephone number has already been saved (fig.2, item 210);

providing the user with guidance when the first voice tag corresponding to any telephone number has not already been saved (fig.2, item 218);

prompting the user with a second prompt for a second voice tag corresponding to the first telephone number (fig.2, item 224) when the first voice tag corresponding to any telephone number has already been saved (fig.2, items 202-206);

prompting the user with a third prompt for a new voice tag if a recording quality of the corresponding voice tag does not satisfy a quality parameter (fig.2, items 218, 224);

storing the first telephone number and an acceptable recording quality voice tag (fig.3, item 246).

However, Hanson fails to teach incrementing a variable indicating a number of calls received from the first telephone number. Foladare teaches incrementing a value [i.e., variable] indicating a number of calls received from the first telephone number (fig.2; col.5, lines 40-42, col.6, lines 38-47). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hanson to incorporate incrementing a variable indicating a number of calls received from the first telephone number in order to determine a repeat caller.

Hanson further teaches that prompting a user with a first prompt to repeat tag when the variable is equal to or greater than a threshold number (col.3, lines 59-67, col.4, lines 35-49) and the received tag is saved (col.4, lines 35-49). However, Hanson fails to teach a first prompt to save said first telephone number. Foladare teaches a first prompt to save said first telephone number (col.8, lines 17-29). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

Art Unit: 2614

at the time the invention was made to modify Hanson to incorporate a first prompt to save said first telephone number in order to save a phone number of a repeat caller.

Regarding claim 2, Hanson teaches audibly prompting the subscriber (col.3, lines 55-59).

Regarding claims 3, 14, Hanson teaches presenting text on an LCD display (col.4, lines 61-67).

Regarding claims 4 and 21, Hanson teaches that the threshold number is set by a manufacturer (col.3, lines 63-67). (Note: Since, the number of calls can be fixed in the system, it is clearly refers to the threshold number that is set by a manufacturer)

Regarding claims 5 and 22, Hanson teaches that the threshold number is set by the subscriber (col.3, lines 63-67).

Regarding claims 9 and 15, Hanson teaches saving the voice tag corresponding to the first telephone number in a voice-dialing directory [i.e., voice tag file] (fig.3, item 246).

Regarding claim 13, Hanson teaches prompting [i.e., making a request] audibly (col.3, lines 28-30, col.4, lines 48-49).

Regarding claim 19, Hanson teaches that said user interface adapter causes a speaker to prompt said user for a tag (fig.3, item 238) and the received tag is saved (fig.3, item 242). However, Hanson fails to teach user interface adapter causes to prompt said user to save said first telephone number. Foladare teaches user interface adapter causes to prompt said user to save said first telephone number (col.8, lines 17-29). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hanson to incorporate user interface adapter causes to prompt said user to save said first telephone number in order to save a phone number of a repeat caller.

Claim 20 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 19. Furthermore, Hanson fails to teach an LCD display to prompt said user. Foladare teaches an LCD display to prompt said user (col.7, lines 14-25). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hanson to incorporate an LCD display to prompt said user in order to enable a user to enter a caller telephone number such that it can be stored easily.

10. Claims 1-5, 11, 13, 14, 18-22 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foladare et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,978,671) in view of Landell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,994,983).

Regarding claim 1, Foladare teaches receiving an incoming call from a first telephone number (fig.1, 2; col.5, lines 40-42);

incrementing a value [i.e., variable] indicating a number of calls received from the first telephone number (fig.2; col.5, lines 40-42, col.6, lines 38-47);

prompting a subscriber [i.e., user] with a first prompt to enter [i.e., save] the first telephone number along with a corresponding spoken word [i.e., voice tag] when the value is equal to or greater than a threshold number (fig.2; col.4, lines 38-43, col.6, lines 16-19, 24-34, 38-47). (Note: since the alphanumeric identifier includes the ANI information, it is clear that the subscriber is entering the telephone number of the caller and since the alphanumeric identifier includes the ANI information, spoken word, it is clear that the spoken word is corresponding to the telephone number);

checking whether a first voice tag corresponding to any telephone number has already been saved (col.7, lines 35-38);

providing the user with guidance when the first voice tag corresponding to any telephone number has not already been saved (col.7, lines 38-45);

prompting the user with a second prompt for a second voice tag corresponding to the first telephone number when the first voice tag corresponding any telephone number has already been saved (col.7, lines 38-44);

Foladare further teaches storing the first telephone number (col.6, lines 31-34).

However, Foladare does not specifically teach “prompting the user with a third prompt for a new voice tag if a recording quality of the corresponding voice tag does not satisfy a quality parameter” and “storing an acceptable recording quality voice tag”. Landell teaches prompting the user a third prompt for a new phrase [i.e., voice tag] if a recognition [i.e., recording] quality of the corresponding phrase does not satisfy a quality parameter and updating [i.e., storing] an acceptable recognition quality phrase (col.7, line 54- col.8, line 13, lines 35-44). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Foladare to incorporate prompting the user a third prompt for a new voice tag if a recording quality of the corresponding voice tag does not satisfy a quality parameter as well as storing an acceptable recording quality voice tag as taught by Landell. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide spoken phrase without having any noise.

Regarding claim 2, Foladare teaches audibly prompting the subscriber (col.6, lines 16-19, 38-41). (Note: audibly prompting is inherent here)

Regarding claims 3 and 14, Foladare teaches that prompting step comprises presenting text on a display 22 [i.e., LCD display] (fig.1; col.4, lines 63-66).

Regarding claims 4 and 21, Foladare teaches that the threshold number is set by a manufacturer (col.8, lines 49-52). (Note: Since, the number of calls can be fixed in the system, it is clearly refers to the threshold number that is set by a manufacturer)

Regarding claims 5 and 22, Foladare teaches that the threshold number is set by the subscriber (col.8, lines 49-52).

Claims 11 and 27 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Foladare teaches matching [i.e., comparing] the voice tag to a quality parameter (col.7, lines 5-10, 33-38). (Note: quality parameter is inherent here)

Regarding claim 13, Foladare teaches prompting [i.e., making a request] audibly (col.6, lines 16-19, 38-41). (Note: audibly is inherent here)

Claim 18 rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Foladare teaches a receiver configured to receive an incoming call from a first telephone number (fig.1, 2; col.5, lines 40-42).

a processor [i.e., CPU] configured to increment a value [i.e., variable] indicating a number of calls received from the first telephone number (fig.2; col.4, lines 29-37, col.5, lines 40-42, col.6, lines 38-47).

a user interface adapter configured to prompt a subscriber [i.e., user] to enter [i.e., save] the first telephone number along with a corresponding spoken word [i.e., voice tag] when the value is equal to or greater than a threshold number (fig.1, 2; col.4, lines 38-43, col.6, lines 16-

19, 24-34, 38-47). (Note: since the alphanumeric identifier includes the ANI information, it is clear that the subscriber is entering the telephone number of the caller)

a database [i.e., memory] module configured to store the first telephone number (col.6, lines 31-34).

Regarding claim 19, Foladare teaches said user interface adapter causes a speaker to prompt said user to save said first telephone number (col.8, lines 17-29).

Claim 20 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 19. Furthermore, Foladare teaches an LCD display to prompt said user (col.7, lines 14-25).

11. Claims 9 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foladare et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,978,671) in view of Landell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,994,983) further in view of Brady (U.S. Patent No. 5,982,857).

Regarding claims 9 and 15, Foladare teaches saving the voice tag corresponding to the first telephone number (col.6, lines 31-33).

However, Foladare in view of Landell does not specifically teach “saving said voice tag corresponding to said first telephone number in a voice tag file”. Brady teaches saving said voice tag corresponding to the first telephone number in a voice tag file (fig.3; col.4, lines 50, 51, col.5, lines 2-11). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Foladare in view of Landell to allow saving the voice tag corresponding to the first telephone number in a voice tag file as taught by Brady. The

motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide the voice file to store call specific information.

12. Claims 12 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foladare et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,978,671) in view of Landell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,994,983) further in view of Bambini et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,898,392).

Regarding claims 12 and 28, Foladare teaches prompting [i.e., making a request] to the subscriber [i.e., user] to enter [i.e., record] the voice tag in a different location (col.6, lines 31-34). However, Foladare in view of Landell does not specifically teach “different geographic location”. Bambini teaches different geographic location (col.2, line 63- col.3, line 1). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Foladare in view of Landell to incorporate different geographic location as taught by Bambini. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to control the recording of voice at remote location.

13. Claims 29-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson (U.S. Patent No. 5,802,149) in view of Curtis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,377,820).

Regarding claims 29, 38-40, Hanson teaches receiving a voice tag corresponding to a first telephone number, the spoken word having a recording quality (fig.2, item 204; col.3, lines 59-67); (Note: the recording quality is inherent here)

Art Unit: 2614

comparing inherently the recording quality to a quality parameter (col.3, lines 59-67);
prompting a user to re-record the voice tag when the recording quality does not satisfy the quality (fig.2, item 224);
storing [i.e., saving] the voice tag (fig.2, item 206);
matching [i.e., checking] whether the voice tag is a first voice tag to be save (fig.2, item 210); and
informing the user of an option to use voice dialing if the voice tag is the first voice tag to be saved (fig.3, item 248; col.4, lines 46-49).

However, Hanson fails to teach storing/saving voice tag along with quality parameter at the wireless communication device. Courtis teaches storing/saving voice tag along with quality parameter at the wireless communication device (col.2, lines 35-37, col.4, lines 36-51) (Note: the recording quality is inherent here). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hanson to incorporate storing/saving voice tag along with quality parameter at the wireless communication device in order to dial a called party telephone number locally at a caller's wireless device.

Regarding claims 30, 34, Hanson teaches prompting the user audibly (col.3, lines 28-30, col.4, lines 48-49).

Regarding claims 31, 35, Hanson teaches that prompting step comprises presenting text on a personal computer [i.e., LCD display] (col.4, lines 61-67).

Regarding claims 32, 37, Hanson teaches a step of saving the first telephone number before the step of receiving (col.3, lines 59-61).

Regarding claim 33, Hanson teaches asking the user to utilize a voice dialing feature (fig.3, item 248; col.4, lines 46-49).

Regarding claim 36, Hanson teaches matching [i.e., checking] whether a first voice tag corresponding to any telephone number has already been saved (fig.2, item 210);

providing a user with a first prompt for guidance when the first voice tag has not already been saved (fig.2, item 218); and

prompting the user with a second prompt for a second voice tag corresponding to a first telephone number when the first voice tag has already been saved (fig.3, item 238; col.4, lines 34-38).

Regarding claim 41, Hanson teaches ending an operation of prompting for voice dialing if the new voice tag is not the first voice tag to be successfully saved (fig.2, item 218).

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Croft (US 6,493,670) teach Method and apparatus for transmitting DTMF signals employing local speech recognition; and

Padawer et al. (US 2002/0115476) teach Shortcut system for use in a mobile electronic device and method thereof.

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Md S. Elahee whose telephone number is (571) 272-7536. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (571) 272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2614

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ME

MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE

November 21, 2006

FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

